

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Appln. No. 10/619,570  
Docket No. Q75625

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3 are independent claims.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has acknowledged the claim for foreign priority and has confirmed receipt of the priority document.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has indicated that claims 3-5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, Applicant has rewritten claim 3 in independent form.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103**

***Shouji in view of APA***

Claims 1, 2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shouji (US 6,715,880) in view of APA.

Shouji is only prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Therefore, Applicant files concurrently herewith a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, with supporting exhibits A-C, to establish that at least the subject matter of claims 1, 2, and 6 of the present application was invented before July 3, 2002, *i.e.*, before Shouji's filing date. Consequently, Shouji is removed as prior art with respect to claims 1, 2, and 6 of the present application.

***Shimizu and Sawamura***

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Shimizu (US 6,588,908). Claims 1 and 2 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Appln. No. 10/619,570  
Docket No. Q75625

allegedly unpatentable over Shimizu. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Sawamura (US 6,357,878) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA”).

Shimizu and Sawamura each disclose a rear projector device having a digital micrometer device (“DMD”), a reflective mirror, and a prism that reflects light toward the DMD. *See* Shimizu at Fig. 1 & Sawamura at Fig. 2.

According to the rejection, it appears to be the Examiner’s position that the reflective surface of each of Shimizu’s total internal reflection (“TIR”) prism 18 and Sawamura’s prism 21 corresponds to the recited “second reflective mirror.”

As such, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the image reflecting apparatus also includes “a prism, wherein the light reflected onto the movable mirror surface of the digital micromirror panel by the second reflective mirror is also reflected by the prism.” Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is supported by the original specification at least by the *non-limiting* embodiment shown in Figs. 3 and 4 and discussed in paragraphs 31 and 32.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection at least because neither Shimizu, Sawamura, or the APA, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests an image reflecting apparatus having two reflective mirrors and also having a prism that reflects light. For example, although Shimizu’s TIR prism 18 might correspond to either the prism or one of the two reflective mirrors, Shimizu’s prism 18 cannot correspond to both.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Appln. No. 10/619,570  
Docket No. Q75625

The fact that the image reflecting device of amended claim 1 has *inter alia* two reflective mirrors and a prism that reflects light allows the image reflecting system to have a compact size.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of amended claim 1. In addition, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 6 at least because of their dependency from claim 1.

#### **New Claims**

Finally, Applicant has added new dependent claims 7-9 in order to provide additional claim coverage. Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to allow claims 7-9 at least because of their dependency, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1 and 3.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

  
John M. Bird  
Registration No. 46,027